Message

From: Hathaway, Margaret [Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov]

Sent: 9/16/2020 3:50:10 PM

To: Meadows, Sarah [Meadows.Sarah@epa.gov]

Subject: FW: dicamba registration

From: Echeverria, Marietta < Echeverria. Marietta @epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2020 5:13 PM

To: Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>; Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel

<Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: dicamba registration

Please include in our tracker

From: Steve Smith < ssmith@REDGOLD.com > **Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 5:10 PM

To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta

<Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: dicamba registration

Ed, Mike and Marietta,

Thank you so much for your generous time commitment today. I have always found my discussions with your side of the agency to be very open and honestly digging for information and today followed that pattern.

I hope I was able to convey my experience in this topic to confirm the genuine nature of my concerns are well founded and have been verified through the experiences of the past few years.

To summarize:

- We desperately need a residue tolerance to reduce liability in the case of an off-target movement
- The earlier a cut-off could be put in place, the lower the damage potential
- 110 foot buffers are inadequate
- Agriculture faces a "black-eye" from the negative publicity dicamba has brought to the industry
- Label requirements essentially make it impossible to do an on-label application
- Alternative weed control methods are now available
- There should be a prohibition against subsequent crop use of the same chemistry.

I will follow up with more formal comments. Again, thank you so much!

Steve

Steve Smith | Senior Director of Agriculture | Red Gold

Tel 765.754.7525 x1419 | Mobile 765.617.1090

ssmith@redgold.com | www.RedGoldFoods.com